

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLENE STITH,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-00947 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

VICTORIA GREEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-00973 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

TREMAINE CARROLL,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

No. 1:23-cv-00974 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Defendants.
JONATHAN ROBERTSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.
FANCY MOORE LIPSEY,
Plaintiff,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.
RAYSHAWN HART,
Plaintiff,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.
CRYSTAL GRAHAM
Plaintiff,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.

OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

No. 1:23-cv-00975 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF’S
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL’S RESPONSE, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

No. 1:23-cv-00976 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF’S
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL’S RESPONSE, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

No. 1:23-cv-00977 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF’S
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL’S RESPONSE, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

No. 1:23-cv-01323 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF’S
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL’S RESPONSE, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

ROXANNE PURDAGONE,
Plaintiff,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-01324 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

ZENAIDA CORDOVA
Plaintiff,
v.
GREG RODRIGUEZ, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:24-cv-00482 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

On October 29, 2024, in Carroll v. State of California, No. 1:23-cv-00974 JLT GSA, the Court ordered Deputy Attorney General ("DAG") Arthur B. Mark, III – who represents named defendants in the other matters that have been related – to inform the Court whether the Office of the Attorney General ("OAG") was representing any defendants in the Carroll case, and if so, to file a notice of appearance. See Carroll, ECF No. 26. DAG Mark was given seven days to file a response to the Court's order.

On November 4, 2024, DAG Mark made a special appearance on behalf of Respondent OAG, and filed a response to the Court's order. Based on the contents of that response, the Court reviewed the docket in Carroll and the dockets in the related matters identified above and notes that no proofs of service indicating that the operative complaint in each matter was served on the appropriate defendant(s) have been filed with the Court. Therefore, counsel for Plaintiffs, Attorney Joseph A. Virgilio, will be ordered to inform the Court why he has not filed the appropriate proofs of service with the Court. As an alternative to informing the Court why the proofs of service have not been filed, Attorney Virgilio may file them in each of the above-referenced cases. Counsel will be given seven days to take either course of action.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Counsel for Plaintiffs, Attorney Joseph A. Virgilio, shall INFORM the Court why he has not filed proofs of service of the operative complaints in each of the above-referenced matters;

2. As an alternative to informing the Court why the proofs of service have not been filed, Attorney Virgilio may FILE the proofs of service of the operative complaints in each of the above-referenced matters, and

3. Attorney Virgilio will be given seven days from the date of this order to take either course of action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 9, 2024

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE